

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 9 of 16

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The first attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. The second attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 6. This sheet, which includes Fig. 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6.

Attachment: Two Replacement Sheets.

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 10 of 16

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-57 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND Claims 20-23, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35-38, 40, and 41 and **Figs. 5 and 6** of the Drawings.

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 29-34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants amended **Fig. 5** to correct reference numeral "12C" to --120-- and amended **Fig. 6** to correct the top instance of reference numeral "122" to --128--.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20-25, 35-37, 39-42, 44, 46-52, and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath (U.S. 5,730,609). The Examiner rejected Claims 41, 42, and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korsunsky et al. (U.S. 6,039,583). The Examiner rejected Claims 26-28, 38, 43, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath in view of Korsunsky et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 20-28 and 35-57.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of contacts;
a first electrically conducting plate; and
a second electrically conducting plate positioned opposite to and oriented substantially in parallel with the first electrically conducting plate;
wherein
the first and the second electrically conducting plates each include a plurality of fingers disposed therein; and
each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates. (emphasis added)

Applicants amended Claim 20 to recite the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates."

In the last paragraph on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Harwath teaches each feature recited in Applicants' Claim 20, except for

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 11 of 16

the feature that at least one of the first group of conducting members is substantially identical to one of the second group of conducting members. Further, the Examiner alleged, "[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to change the shape since a change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art."

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's standard of determining obviousness, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants amended claim 20 to recite the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates."

Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest this feature. The conductive metal shield 112 of Harwath, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the first and second electrically conducting plates recited in claim 20, fails to teach or suggest the use of fingers. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates" as recited in Applicants' claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath.

Claim 41 has been amended to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of electrically conducting members arranged along a row;
at least one electrically conducting plate disposed substantially
parallel to the row of electrically conducting members; and
a plurality of connection portions, each of the plurality of connection
portions corresponds to one of the plurality of connection portions;
wherein

**for each conducting member arranged along the row, the
conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and
the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a
first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to
be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting
plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can
be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one**

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 12 of 16

electrically conducting plate. (emphasis added)

Applicants amended claim 41 to recite the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate."

In the third paragraph on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Harwath teaches each feature recited in Applicants' claim 41, except for the feature that at least one of the first group of conducting members is substantially identical to one of the second group of conducting members. Further, the Examiner alleged, "[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to change the shape since a change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art."

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's standard of determining obviousness, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants amended claim 41 to recite the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate."

Figs. 7 and 8 of Harwath clearly show that only the ground terminal **48** can be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112** and that the terminals **44** and **46 cannot** be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112**. That is, not every terminal **44**, **46**, and **48** of Harwath can be selected to be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112**. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row,

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 13 of 16

the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate" as recited in Applicants' claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath.

With respect to Korsunsky et al., **Figs. 1 and 3-6** of Korsunsky et al. clearly show that only the contacts **50** of the electrical connector directly adjacent to contacts **92** and **94** of ground plane **60** can be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**, and that the contacts **50** of the electrical connector that are not directly adjacent to contacts **92** and **94** of ground plane **60** cannot be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**. That is, not every contact **50** of Korsunsky et al. can be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Korsunsky et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate" as recited in Applicants' claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korsunsky et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 20 and 41 of the present application. Claims 20-40 and 42-57 depend upon Claims 20 and 41 and are therefore allowable for at least

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 14 of 16

the reasons that Claims 20 and 41 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to December 12, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2005


Attorneys for Applicants

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 9 of 16

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The first attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. The second attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 6. This sheet, which includes Fig. 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6.

Attachment: Two Replacement Sheets.

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 10 of 16

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-57 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND Claims 20-23, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35-38, 40, and 41 and **Figs. 5 and 6** of the Drawings.

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 29-34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants amended **Fig. 5** to correct reference numeral "12C" to --120-- and amended **Fig. 6** to correct the top instance of reference numeral "122" to --128--.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20-25, 35-37, 39-42, 44, 46-52, and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath (U.S. 5,730,609). The Examiner rejected Claims 41, 42, and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korsunsky et al. (U.S. 6,039,583). The Examiner rejected Claims 26-28, 38, 43, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath in view of Korsunsky et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 20-28 and 35-57.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of contacts;
a first electrically conducting plate; and
a second electrically conducting plate positioned opposite to and oriented substantially in parallel with the first electrically conducting plate;
wherein
the first and the second electrically conducting plates each include a plurality of fingers disposed therein; and
each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates. (emphasis added)

Applicants amended Claim 20 to recite the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates."

In the last paragraph on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Harwath teaches each feature recited in Applicants' Claim 20, except for

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 11 of 16

the feature that at least one of the first group of conducting members is substantially identical to one of the second group of conducting members. Further, the Examiner alleged, "[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to change the shape since a change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art."

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's standard of determining obviousness, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants amended claim 20 to recite the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates."

Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest this feature. The conductive metal shield 112 of Harwath, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the first and second electrically conducting plates recited in claim 20, fails to teach or suggest the use of fingers. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest the feature of "each contact of the electrical connector corresponds to one of the plurality of fingers of the first and the second electrically conducting plates" as recited in Applicants' claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath.

Claim 41 has been amended to recite:

An electrical connector, comprising:
a plurality of electrically conducting members arranged along a row;
at least one electrically conducting plate disposed substantially
parallel to the row of electrically conducting members; and
a plurality of connection portions, each of the plurality of connection
portions corresponds to one of the plurality of connection portions;
wherein

**for each conducting member arranged along the row, the
conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and
the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a
first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to
be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting
plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can
be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one**

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 12 of 16

electrically conducting plate. (emphasis added)

Applicants amended claim 41 to recite the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate."

In the third paragraph on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Harwath teaches each feature recited in Applicants' claim 41, except for the feature that at least one of the first group of conducting members is substantially identical to one of the second group of conducting members. Further, the Examiner alleged, "[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to change the shape since a change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art."

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's standard of determining obviousness, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants amended claim 41 to recite the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate."

Figs. 7 and 8 of Harwath clearly show that only the ground terminal **48** can be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112** and that the terminals **44** and **46 cannot** be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112**. That is, not every terminal **44**, **46**, and **48** of Harwath can be selected to be electrically connected to the conductive metal shield **112**. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Harwath fails to teach or suggest the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row,

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 13 of 16

the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate" as recited in Applicants' claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwath.

With respect to Korsunsky et al., **Figs. 1 and 3-6** of Korsunsky et al. clearly show that only the contacts **50** of the electrical connector directly adjacent to contacts **92** and **94** of ground plane **60** can be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**, and that the contacts **50** of the electrical connector that are not directly adjacent to contacts **92** and **94** of ground plane **60** cannot be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**. That is, not every contact **50** of Korsunsky et al. can be selected to be electrically connected to the ground plane **60**. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Korsunsky et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "for each conducting member arranged along the row, the conducting member, the corresponding connections portions, and the at least one electrically conducting plate are arranged such that a first group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate and a second group of the plurality of conducting members can be selected to not be electrically connected to the at least one electrically conducting plate" as recited in Applicants' claim 41.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korsunsky et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 20 and 41 of the present application. Claims 20-40 and 42-57 depend upon Claims 20 and 41 and are therefore allowable for at least

Serial No. 10/822,341
December 12, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005
Page 14 of 16

the reasons that Claims 20 and 41 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to December 12, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2005

Attorneys for Applicants

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125